



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,362	04/29/2004	David J. Hathaway	BUR920040074US1	3361
7590 05/30/2006			EXAMINER	
Andrew M. Calderon Greenblum And Bernstein PLC 1950 Roland Clarke Place Reston, VA 20191			LE, TOAN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2863	

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/709,362	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HATHAWAY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Toan M. Le	<b>Art Unit</b> 2863	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/23/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant, in setting forth a method/computer-readable medium containing instructions when executed cause a computer to determine at least one location information for one or more inputs to a timing test and computing a timing slack variation for the timing test using at least one location information, wherein the one or more inputs comprise cells or elements of interest and wherein the method predicts a delay in circuit paths by considering a portion of the delay that is influenced by a proximity of circuit elements in a path or paths separately from a full delay distribution as in claims 1-6/12-13 and 14-19/25-26 and wherein the at least one location information comprises a centroid of the one or more inputs to timing test as in claims 7-11 and 20-24/31; or identifying an early/late path in the integrated circuit, determining a timing slack variation in the early/late path using location information on one or more elements in the early/late path, and computing a new timing slack for the early/late path by using the timing slack variation in the early/late path as in claims 27-30, has failed to set forth any new and useful/tangible improvement thereof as required by 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claims 1-31 do not recite any more than a mathematical computing a timing slack variation for the timing test in analyzing the timing of a circuit. Thus, the claims do not represent an application of a law of nature or mathematical formula to a structure or process as required.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-9, 12-22, and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by “Blocked-Based Static Timing Analysis with Uncertainty”, Devgan et al. (referred hereafter Devgan et al.).

Referring to claims 1 and 14, Devgan et al. disclose a method and a computer-readable medium containing instructions that, when executed, cause a computer analyzing the timing of a circuit (Abstract), comprising:

determining at least one location information for one or more inputs to a timing test (pages 608-610, entire section 2; figure 1); and

computing a timing slack variation for the timing test using the at least one location information, wherein the one or more inputs comprise cells or elements of interest, and

wherein the method presicts a delay in circuit paths by considering a portion of the delay that is influenced by a proximity of circuit elements in a path or paths separately from a full delay distribution (page 610, 1<sup>st</sup> col., lines 6-17; pages 610-612, entire section 3).

As to claims 2 and 15, Devgan et al. disclose a method and a computer-readable medium containing instructions that, when executed, cause a computer analyzing the timing of a circuit (Abstract), wherein the input to a timing test is a path or a logic cone (figures 8-9).

Art Unit: 2863

Referring to claims 3 and 16, Devgan et al. disclose a method and a computer-readable medium containing instructions that, when executed, cause a computer analyzing the timing of a circuit (Abstract), wherein the at least one location information comprises a bounding region for the one or more inputs to the timing test (page 609, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Max operation section; page 610, section 2.1; figure 5).

As to claims 4 and 17, Devgan et al. disclose a method and a computer-readable medium containing instructions that, when executed, cause a computer analyzing the timing of a circuit (Abstract), wherein said determining comprises defining the bounding region based on the locations of the one or more inputs to the timing test (page 609, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Max operation section; page 610, section 2.1; figure 5).

Referring to claims 5 and 18, Devgan et al. disclose a method and a computer-readable medium containing instructions that, when executed, cause a computer analyzing the timing of a circuit (Abstract), wherein said determining further comprises modifying a size of the bounding region to account for variations in delay among the one or more inputs to the timing test (page 609, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., last paragraph; page 610, 1<sup>st</sup> col., lines 1-5 and section 2.1).

As to claims 6 and 19, Devgan et al. disclose a method and a computer-readable medium containing instructions that, when executed, cause a computer analyzing the timing of a circuit (Abstract), wherein said computing comprises:

determining a slack variation factor based on the size of the bounding region; and

adding the slack variation factor to a timing slack calculated for the one or more inputs to the timing test (page 609, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Addition Operation section; page 610, section 2.1).

Referring to claims 7 and 20, Devgan et al. disclose a method and a computer-readable medium containing instructions that, when executed, cause a computer analyzing the timing of a circuit (Abstract), comprising:

determining at least one location information for one or more inputs to a timing test (pages 608-610, entire section 2); and

computing a timing slack for the timing test using the at least one location information, wherein the at least one location information comprises a centroid of the one or more inputs to the timing test (page 610, 1<sup>st</sup> col., lines 6-17; pages 610-612, entire section 3; figure 9).

As to claims 8 and 21, Devgan et al. disclose a method and a computer-readable medium containing instructions that, when executed, cause a computer analyzing the timing of a circuit (Abstract), wherein the centroid comprises the averaged location of the one or more inputs to the timing test (figure 9).

Referring to claims 9 and 22, Devgan et al. disclose a method and a computer-readable medium containing instructions that, when executed, cause a computer analyzing the timing of a circuit (Abstract), wherein the centroid comprises the delay-weighted averaged location of the one or more inputs to the timing test (figure 9).

As to claims 12 and 25, Devgan et al. disclose a method and a computer-readable medium containing instructions that, when executed, cause a computer analyzing the timing of a circuit (Abstract), wherein the at least one location information comprises an abstract location information (page 607, 1<sup>st</sup> col., section 1: 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph).

Referring to claims 13 and 26, Devgan et al. disclose a method and a computer-readable medium containing instructions that, when executed, cause a computer analyzing the timing of a

Art Unit: 2863

circuit (Abstract), wherein the abstract location information is based upon correlation of delay functions (page 610, section 2.1).

As to claim 27, Devgan et al. disclose a method of analyzing the timing of an integrated circuit (Abstract), comprising:

identifying an early path and a late path in the integrated circuit (figures 8-9);

determining a timing slack variation in the early path using location information an one or more elements i n the early path;

determining a timing slack variation in the late path using location information an one or more elements in the late path (pages 608-610, section 2); and

computing a new timing slack for the early path and the late path by using the timing slack variation in the early path and the timing slack variation in the late path (page 610, 1<sup>st</sup> col., lines 6-17).

Referring to claim 28, Devgan et al. disclose a method of analyzing the timing of an integrated circuit (Abstract), wherein the location information an the one or more elements in the early path and the location information an the one or more elements in the late path comprise bounding regions defined around the one or more elements in the early path and the one or more elements in the late path, respectively (page 609, 2<sup>nd</sup> col., Max Operation section; page 610, section 2.1).

As to claim 29, Devgan et al. disclose a method of analyzing the timing of an integrated circuit (Abstract), wherein the location information on the one or more elements in the early path and the location information on the one or more elements in the late path comprise centroids

Art Unit: 2863

calculated by considering the one or more elements in the early path and the one or more elements in the late path, respectively, as aggregates (figure 9).

Referring to claim 30, Devgan et al. disclose a method of analyzing the timing of an integrated circuit (Abstract), wherein the method is performed for an early mode timing analysis of the integrated circuit and a late mode timing analysis of the integrated circuit (page 608, 2nd col., section 2: 1<sup>st</sup> and last paragraphs).

As to claim 31, Devgan et al. disclose a computer-readable medium containing instructions that, when executed, cause a computer analyzing the timing of a circuit (Abstract), wherein a delay in circuit paths by considering a portion of the delay that is influenced by a proximity of circuit elements in a path or paths separately from a full delay distribution (page 610, 1<sup>st</sup> col., lines 6-17; pages 610-612, entire section 3).

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 3/23/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Referring to claims 1 and 14, Applicant argues that "However, it is not apparent that DEVGAN discloses, or even suggest, that the method predicts a delay in circuit paths by considering a portion of the delay that is influenced by a proximity of circuit elements in a path or paths separately from a full delay distribution."

Answer: Devgan discloses "In general, an input of a gate may depend on more than one previous mode. For example, in Figure 9, the inputs of the gate 5 depends on A, B, C and D.

Art Unit: 2863

Some of these vertices may also share subpaths when reaching the inputs of gate 5. Therefore, when computing the arrival time at the output of gate 5, this dependency must be accounted for. To accomplish this, we maintain a Dependency List (DL) with each vertex in the timing graph which lists the vertices on which the arrival time of the current vertex depends.... The DL is propagated as we compute the statistical arrival times using the DLPropagate algorithm shown in Figure 10.” In addition, Figure 9 shows “other logic” for a portion of the delay that is influenced by a proximity of circuit elements in a path or paths separately from a full delay distribution.

Thus, Devgan does teach predicts a delay in circuit paths by considering a portion of the delay that is influenced by a proximity of circuit elements in a path or paths separately from a full delay distribution.

As to claims 7 and 20, Applicant argues that “Furthermore, while the Examiner has identified page 610, col. 1, lines 6-17 and pages 610-612, section 3 and Figure 9 as disclosing that the at least one location information comprises a centroid of the one or more inputs to the timing test (claims 7 and 20), it is apparent that the cited language is silent with regard to utilizing in the analysis a centroid of the one or more inputs to the timing test. Nor has the Examiner explained how such language or the drawing of Figure 9 can be interpreted to disclose or suggest utilizing a centroid of the one or more inputs to the timing test in the analysis”

Answer: Devgan discloses “In general, an input of a gate may depend on more than one previous node. For example, in Figure 9, the inputs of the gate 5 depends on A, B, C and D. Some of these vertices may also share subpaths when reaching the inputs of gate 5. Therefore, when computing the arrival time at the output of gate 5, this dependency must be accounted for. To accomplish this, we maintain a Dependency List (DL) with each vertex in the timing graph

Art Unit: 2863

which lists the vertices on which the arrival time of the current vertex depends.... The DL is propagated as we compute the statistical arrival times using the DLPropagate algorithm shown in Figure 10.” In addition, Figure 9 shows “other logic” for a centroid of the one or more inputs to the timing test.

Therefore, Devgan does teach at least one location information comprises a centroid of the one or more inputs to the timing test.

Referring to claim 27, Applicant argues that “there is no apparent disclosure or suggestion indicating that both early and late path are accounted for, much less, that a timing slack variation thereof is utilized in the analysis.” And that “DEVGAN clearly fails to disclose the logic cone of claims 2 and 15, the bounding region recited in claims 3-6, 16-19 and 28, and abstract location information of claims 12, 13, 25, and 26.”

Answer: Devgan discloses in figure 8, “We illustrate the basic principle behind our approach through the circuit in Figure 8. In this examples, two paths originating from node r reconverge as inputs to the same gate at node i and j (logic cone as defined in the Spec. as the entire set of gates which converge on a timing test [0020]). This causes both the arrival time  $A_i$  and  $A_j$  to depend on arrival time  $A_r$ .” And “It should be noted that the interdependence of arrival time  $A_i$  and  $A_j$  has a very specific linear form. That is  $A_i = A_r + D_1$  and  $A_j = A_r + D_2$ . The variable of interest, arrival time at node o,  $A_o$  is given by  $A_o = \max(A_r + D_1 + D_{io} + A_r + D_2 + D_{jo})$  (page 611, 1<sup>st</sup> col., 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph).

Thus, Devgan does teach an early/late path and timing slack variation and bounding region.

Figure 8 also show "Delay from Node r to Node i through Path 1 and Delay from Node r to Node j through Path 2."

Therefore, Devgan does teach abstract location information.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan M. Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-2276. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Barlow can be reached on (571) 272-2269. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Toan Le

May 22, 2006

BRYAN BUI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

